

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00090 031840Z

53

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

USIE-00 ERDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-11

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /084 W

----- 108772

O P 031743Z MAR 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1474

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 0090

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF  
MARCH 2, 1976

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE MARCH 2 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE BELGIN REP, FRG REP AND US REP, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV AND SHUSTOV, GDR REP OESER AND POLISH REP DABROWA. BY PREVIOUS ARRANGEMENT, THE SUBJECT MATTER WAS FORCE DEFINITIONS AND EXPERTS FROM THE PARTICIPATING DELEGATIONS WERE PRESENT.

2. IN THE COURSE OF THE DISCUSSION, EASTERN REPS DROPPED THE PREVIOUS EASTERN REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIFIC ALLOCATION OF THE THREE DISPUTED FORCE TYPES--SSM, HELICOPTER AND GROUND-BASED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE--AS A PREREQUISITE FOR AGREEMENT ON ANY

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00090 031840Z

DEFINITION. INSTEAD, THEY SUGGESTED THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD

AGREE TO APPLY THE PRINCIPLE OF ALLOCATING SIMILAR FORCES ON BOTH SIDES TO THE SAME SERVICE CATEGORY, GROUND OR AIR, IN THESE THREE CASES, BUT THAT SPECIFIC ALLOCATION SHOULD BE POSTPONED TO A LATER STAGE. THE FORMULATION PROPOSED BY EASTERN REPS INDICATED THAT THE PRINCIPLE OF LIKES TO LIKES WAS SPECIFICALLY LINKED TO THE THREE DISPUTED CASES RATHER THAN SET FORWARD AS A GENERAL PRINCIPLE. IT ALSO LEFT OPEN THE ISSUE AS TO WHETHER THE DISPUTED FORCE TYPES WOULD BE ALLOCATED TO GROUND OR AIR. HOWEVER, EASTERN REPS REFUSED TO DISCUSS IN DETAIL THAT PORTION OF A POSSIBLE DEFINITION DEALING WITH COMPREHENSIVENESS AND EXCLUSIONS AND INCLUSIONS UNTIL AFTER THE ALLIES HAD AGREED TO THE NEW EASTERN FORMULATION. ALLIED REPS DECLINED TO DO THIS.

3. IN THE COURSE OF THE DISCUSSION EASTERN REPS ALSO SUGGESTED THAT, AS WELL AS THE EASTERN WORD "TROOPS" (VOISKA), THE TEXT OF AN AGREED DEFINITION COULD USE THE TERM "SERVICEMEN" PROPOSED BY THE WEST.

EASTERN REPS ALSO SUGGESTED THAT THE TERMINOLOGY USED BY EACH SIDE IN ITS OWN FORMULA FOR ALLOCATING THE FORCES IN THE AREA TO GROUND OR AIR FORCES SHOULD BE DISCUSSED, IMPLYING THAT THEY HAD IN MIND SOME COMMON ALLOCATION FORMULA IN THIS REGARD.

4. US REP OPENED WITH CRITICISM THAT EASTERN DELEGATIONS HAD VIOLATED CONFIDENTIALITY BY REVEALING TO THE PRESS DETAILS OF THE FEB 17 EASTERN PROPOSAL. KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT THE EAST HAD A MORAL RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF AGAINST LARGE-SCALE WESTERN LEAKS OF THE CONTENT OF THE DEC 16, 1975 WESTERN PROPOSAL.

5. TURNING TO THE FORCE DEFINITION ISSUE, GDR REP SUGGESTED DESIRABILITY OF WORKING OUT COMMON TERMINOLOGY FOR A DEFINITION. GDR REP'S PRESENTATION WAS UNCLEAR. SUBSEQUENT WESTERN QUESTIONS ELICITED THAT EAST APPARENTLY HAD IN MIND USE OF COMMON TERMINOLOGY IN THE SECTION OF A DEFINITION ALLOCATING FORCES TO GROUND AND AIR AND ALSO THROUGHOUT THE REMAINDER OF A DEFINITION. FRG REP SAID PARTICIPANTS SHOULD PROCEED TO REACH AGREEMENT ON SPECIFIC FORMULATIONS COVERING COMPREHENSIVENESS AND ON DISTINGUISHING ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES, WHILE SETTING ASIDE FOR LATER RESOLUTION THE ISSUE OF THE THREE DISPUTED FORCE TYPES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00090 031840Z

6. POLISH REP SAID THAT HITHERTO, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD PROPOSED A SPECIFIC ALLOCATION FOR THESE FORCES, BUT IN VIEW OF ALLIED INSISTENCE ON DATA, WHICH EAST WAS NOT PREPARED TO MEET, AND IN ORDER TO CONTRIBUTE TO PROGRESS TOWARD AN AGREED DEFINITION, THE EAST WAS WILLING TO AGREE TO A FORMULATION ON THE LINES THAT THE THREE DISPUTED TYPES OF FORCES SHOULD BE CLASSIFIED IN SUCH A WAY THAT THESE THREE TYPES OF FORCES OF

EACH SIDE SHOULD FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS BE ALLOCATED TO THE SAME SERVICE CATEGORY ON BOTH SIDES. THE SPECIFIC QUESTION AS TO WHICH SERVICE CATEGORY, GROUND OR AIR, THESE THREE TYPES OF FORCES SHOULD BELONG WOULD BE DECIDED LATER ON THE BASIS OF MUTUAL AGREEMENT.

7. ALLIED REPS POINTED OUT THAT THE ALLIED SUGGESTION THAT THE ISSUE OF THE THREE DISPUTED FORCE TYPES BE POSTPONED FOR LATER SOLUTION WAS INTENDED TO CREATE CONDITIONS FOR WORKING OUT THE REMAINDER OF TEXT OF A DEFINITION, INCLUDING PROVISIONS ON COMPREHENSIVENESS. THEY ASKED WHETHER EAST HAD THE SAME OBJECTIVE IN MIND. KHLESTOV INSISTED THAT THE EAST WANTED WEST TO AGREE TO EAST'S "COMPROMISE" FORMULATION ON THE THIRD PRINCIPLE BEFORE GOING ON TO TREAT THE REMAINDER OF A DEFINITION IN DETAIL. USREP SUGGESTED PARALLEL TREATMENT OF ISSUES OF COMPREHENSIVENESS, ALLOCATION OF ALL FORCES TO TWO SERVICE CATEGORIES, AND FORMULA TO BE USED TO POSTPONE SOLUTION OF THREE DISPUTED FORCE TYPES. KHLESTOV AGAIN INSISTED THAT AGREEMENT MUST FIRST BE REACHED ON THE NEW EASTERN PROPOSAL WITH REGARD TO THE THIRD PRINCIPLE BEFORE THE REMAINDER OF DEFINITION COULD BE TREATED IN DETAIL.

8. BELGIAN REP MADE GENERAL CASE FOR EXCHANGE OF DATA. GDR REP SUGGESTED THAT SESSION BE CONCLUDED AND THAT PARTICIPANTS DEAL WITH GENERAL TOPICS, RATHER THAN DEFINITIONS, IN THE NEXT SESSION, SCHEDULED FOR MARCH 9. END SUMMARY.

REMAINDER OF REPORT SENT VIA AIRGRAM.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, NEGOTIATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 03 MAR 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** saccheem  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976MBFRV00090  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D760081-0196  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t197603100/aaaadkat.tel  
**Line Count:** 143  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** saccheem  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 25 MAR 2004  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <25 MAR 2004 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <03 AUG 2004 by saccheem>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF MARCH 2, 1976  
**TAGS:** PARM, OCON, XH, BE, US, GE, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006